



**EDWARD BYRNE MEMORIAL
STATE AND LOCAL
LAW ENFORCEMENT
ASSISTANCE FORMULA
GRANT PROGRAM**

**2006 State Annual Report
FFY 2004 Projects**

**Ohio Department of Public Safety (ODPS)
Office of Criminal Justice Services (OCJS)**

1970 W. Broad Street
Columbus, Ohio 43223
Toll-free: (800) 448-4842
Telephone: (614) 466-7782
Fax: (614) 466-0308
<http://www.ocjs.state.oh.us>

Bob Taft, Governor
Bruce Johnson, Lt. Governor
Kenneth L. Morckel, Director, ODPS
Karhlton F. Moore, Executive Director, OCJS



OHIO OFFICE OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE SERVICES

Edward J. Byrne Memorial

State Annual Report

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
INTRODUCTION	5
EVALUATION PLAN AND ACTIVITIES	7
SUMMARY OF PROGRAMS FUNDED UNDER THE BYRNE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAM, FFY 2004	8
Program Area A – Law Enforcement Tasks Forces.....	8
Program Area B – Crime Prevention and Community Policing	13
Program Area C – Corrections, Alternatives, and Treatment	20
Program Area D –Victim Services.....	25
Program Area E – Criminal Justice Information Systems (CJIS).....	29

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Ohio Office of Criminal Justice Services (OCJS) implemented the fiscal year (FY) 2004 Edward Byrne Memorial Program with the goal of assisting local and state government in preventing and controlling illegal drugs, reducing incidents of violent crime, and improving the overall functioning of the criminal justice system. The table "Ohio Programs and Byrne Goals" notes which programs are relevant to the Byrne Formula Grant Program goals.

Ohio Programs and Byrne Goals

<i>Program Area</i>	<i>Prevent and Control Illegal Drugs</i>	<i>Reduce Violent Crime</i>	<i>Improve Overall Operations</i>
Law Enforcement Task Forces	X	X	X
Crime Prevention and Community Policing	X	X	
Corrections, Alternatives, and Treatment	X	X	
Victim Services		X	X
Criminal Justice Information Systems (CJIS)		X	X

Bold denotes programs with independent evaluations during Calendar Year 2005.

The performance of each program based on all Byrne-funded projects active during calendar year (CY) 2005 is summarized below.

Multi-Jurisdictional Law Enforcement Task Forces

Ohio's law enforcement task forces accomplished their CY 2005 goals, posting increases for virtually all performance measures. During the year, the task forces arrested 6,544 offenders, with 4,686 of these offenders being charged with felony offenses. Ohio's drug markets were impacted by the task forces seizing 231,735 grams of cocaine and 78,726 grams of crack, 173,389 pounds of processed marijuana and 12,176 marijuana plants. Ohio's task forces also hit criminal enterprise by seizing \$14,221,218 in criminal assets. In addition to the quantities of arrests, drugs, and assets, the task forces took numerous steps to improve Ohio's justice system. Most notable is the improved coordination attained through implementation of the Ohio Task Force Commanders Association's Task Force Information System (TFIS).

Crime Prevention and Community Policing

During 2005, the Ohio Crime Prevention/COP program accomplished its objectives by providing services for 13,799 people. This total includes 2,799 youth. Projects funded through Crime Prevention/COP provided 309 programs, 190 of which served adults (61 percent) and 119 that served juveniles (39 percent). Programs serving juveniles included substance abuse prevention, youth violence prevention, school-related programs working with at-risk youth, school resource officers, workforce development programs, life skill development, and general delinquency reduction. Most of the programs for adults involved crime reduction/prevention through increased law enforcement efforts. Training was a component of more than one-third of the adult programs. A total of 179 training

opportunities took place, with 1,583 people trained. Forty-two percent of those trained were law enforcement and 51 percent were service agencies.

In addition to these direct service projects, funding was provided for five university research studies on crime prevention. Study topics included: crime opportunity prevention services, the use of local justice data for planning purposes, analysis of NIBRS data for reporting law enforcement agencies and the communities they serve, juvenile risk assessment, and citizen attitudes toward disaster preparedness and homeland security.

Corrections, Alternatives, and Treatment

During CY 2005, the Corrections, Alternatives, and Treatment program accomplished its goal of providing community correction alternatives that serve the offenders' treatment needs. The projects reported serving 4,117 offenders. Seventy-three percent of the offenders served in this program were male. The distribution by race/ethnicity was: 20 percent African-American, 71 percent Caucasian, one percent Latino, and eight percent other or unknown race/ethnicity. An average of 38.5 bed days were saved for each offender in projects designed as alternatives to incarceration.

More than half of the projects provide mental health treatment/education (65 percent) and substance abuse treatment/education (63 percent). Other services provided by 10 percent or more of the projects were: job training/placement (49 percent), family services (25 percent), basic education/GED (20 percent), assessment (14 percent), and problem-solving skills development (13 percent). Offenders in this program averaged 34.9 hours of treatment per week. When the service was provided by a project, offenders received an average of 5.5 hours per week for both substance abuse education and cognitive-behavioral treatment. Other types of services for which offenders received three hours or more treatment per week were: problem-solving skills development (4.2 hours), educational/vocational training (3.9 hours), and Twelve Step (3.8 hours).

Of the offenders terminated from these programs during CY 2005, 68 percent successfully completed their respective program. Those successfully completing their curriculum averaged 162 days in the program. Twenty percent of the offenders were unsuccessfully terminated from the program, two percent absconded, and 10 percent were terminated under another status. Lack of cooperation was the most common reason for unsuccessful termination (56 percent). Failed urinalysis and other indications of drug use were responsible for 19 percent of those unsuccessfully terminated.

Victim Services

During CY 2005, Ohio's Victim Services program served 16,761 victims of crime. Eighty-nine percent of these people were victims of violent crime. Domestic violence accounted for 55 percent of all victims served by the Ohio program. Victims of rape accounted for another 11 percent of the victims. Seventy-three percent of the victims served were female. Seventy-two percent of the victims were Caucasian, 18 percent African-American, one percent Latino, and the remainder was of another racial group or their race/ethnicity was unknown. Mentally/emotionally challenged victims were 42 percent of the special needs populations served by Ohio's Victim Services program. Thirty percent were juveniles and 11 percent were Appalachians. No other group comprised more than 10 percent of the special needs populations served.

Crisis intervention, court advocacy, and education were the services most commonly provided directly to victims by the Ohio projects during CY 2005. More than 70 percent of the Victim Services projects provided each of these three direct services. Medical services were the least likely to be directly provided (12 percent). More than half of the Ohio projects made referrals for counseling, shelter, court advocacy, medical services, and crisis intervention.

Criminal Justice Information Systems (CJIS)

The CJIS Policy Board continues to meet on a regular basis to monitor progress of the tasks within the CJIS Improvement Plan and to provide management and technical expertise for the strategic initiatives within the CJIS Plan. The plan was updated in 2002. Of the 79 tasks and subtasks, 48 are complete, 10 are closed, seven are ongoing, five are active, and nine have not yet been initiated.

Notable accomplishments during CY 2005 include:

- The Ohio Department of Public Safety (ODPS) is upgrading its Law Enforcement Automated Data System (LEADS) system to have its connected devices National Crime Information Center 2000 Services compliant. ODPS completed the first phase to convert to DMPP2020 protocol. Some of the regional interface agencies are now complete.
- The Ohio Law Enforcement Officer's Toolkit (LEOT) is an Ohio Incident-Based Reporting System/National Incident-Based Reporting System (OIBRS/NIBRS)-compliant records management system developed by OCJS. By the end of 2005 there were 313 Ohio law enforcement agencies using the existing system. It is anticipated that the LEOT will reach Ohio Local Law Enforcement Information Sharing Network (OLLEISN) Level II certification early in 2006.
- More than 315 Ohio law enforcement agencies contributed data to the OIBRS Repository in 2005, which was then electronically forwarded to the FBI in the NIBRS format. The OIBRS Portal was enhanced to enable agencies to view their IBR validation errors online before submitting their data to OCJS. An OIBRS Partners Portal was also unveiled, enabling vendors to check their edits in their software applications online against the edits in the OIBRS Repository.
- Recommendations to the Policy Board led to the creation of the Juvenile Justice Information System (JJIS) Steering Committee. The goal is to electronically connect the 88 Ohio juvenile courts to share information and enable electronic report transmission to the Ohio Department of Youth Services. By the end of 2005, there were 16 counties with signed MOUs to enable their data to be searchable through JJIS, and six counties were actually searchable through JJIS.

FUND DISTRIBUTION AND STRATEGY DEVELOPMENT

In three of Ohio's six metropolitan counties, regional planning units (RPUs) conduct comprehensive criminal and juvenile justice planning and administer grant funds locally. Local priorities are established within the parameters of the state strategy, based on the identification of local needs. Each of the three RPUs has its own unique way of identifying local needs. For example:

- Franklin County conducts a needs assessment. The results are reviewed and presented to the justice planning committee. The committee determines the funding priorities based on the needs assessment.
- Lucas County holds public hearings, out of which comes information and concerns that form the foundation for funding priorities for the coming year.

- Cuyahoga County has a supervisory board made up of several standing committees. It is the responsibility of the various committees to identify local problems and concerns and to then make recommendations to the supervisory board. The board then reviews the identified issues and authorizes priorities. Those priorities are weighted for the review process and impact the funding decisions.

SECTION I:

INTRODUCTION TO PROGRAMS ACTIVE DURING CY 2005 AND FUNDED UNDER THE BYRNE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAM FROM FFY 2004

I. A. OVERVIEW OF PROGRAMS

A comprehensive needs assessment conducted by OCJS in 2000 identified the following priorities:

- Promoting the philosophy of community oriented policing (COP).
- Reducing violent crime, making available effective treatment/correctional programming for adjudicated/convicted offenders.
- Promoting the collection and use of justice-related data.
- Promoting restoration for crime victims.
- Sustaining and expanding coordination of multi-jurisdictional enforcement agencies.
- Promoting equity and efficiency in the administration of criminal justice.

To meet these priorities, OCJS offered five program areas in which local constituents could apply.

Multi-Jurisdictional Law Enforcement Task Forces

This program contributes to the goal of reducing the impact of drug and firearm traffickers, pharmaceutical diversion, gangs, terrorism, and other organized criminal activity on the health and safety of Ohio citizens through multi-jurisdictional collaboration. Enforcement activities serve to reduce and control drugs and violent crime. Multi-jurisdictional coordination also helps to improve overall justice system operations.

Crime Prevention and Community Policing

The goal of this program is to prevent and reduce crime and the fear it brings to communities through collaborative crime prevention in order to maintain order, solve problems, and improve the quality of life for Ohio citizens. By accomplishing these goals, the program assists in controlling drugs and reducing violent crime.

Corrections, Alternatives, and Treatment

This program is designed to increase community-based alternatives to incarceration and detention for non-violent offenders in Ohio, including residential and non-residential substance abuse programs, and drug and mental health courts. By intervening in the drug-crime cycle, this program contributes to both the goals of controlling illegal drugs and reducing violent crime.

Victim Services

It is the goal of this program to provide crime victims with needed services so that they may overcome the trauma of victimization, participate at all critical states of the criminal justice process, and return to full, active lives. The importance of victim services found in the 2000 Byrne Needs Assessment was later reinforced in OCJS's 2001 Family Violence Needs Assessment. Effective victim services contribute to the long-term operations of the justice system. Effective intervention can also contribute to a reduction in violent crime.

Criminal Justice Information Systems (CJIS)

The lack of adequate and timely criminal justice information has a profound impact on the ability of Ohio's criminal justice system to respond to crime in the state. This is felt in two basic ways. One is the lack of complete and timely information regarding individuals arrested or convicted for criminal offenses. For example, incomplete conviction records have resulted in much more lenient sentences for specific individuals than would have occurred if the judge had a complete conviction history available. Secondly, the ability of the state and local government to allocate criminal justice resources is limited by insufficient information regarding persons involved in the criminal justice system.

I. B. COORDINATION EFFORTS

Violence Against Women Act (VAWA)

OCJS worked with the Ohio Family Violence Advisory Council and the OCJS Criminal Justice Advisory Policy Board to develop recommendations for the VAWA program. Consistent with those recommendations, during CY 2005 Ohio awarded funds to law enforcement, prosecutors, and direct victim service providers.

The STOP program (Services Training Officers Prosecution) supports statewide efforts to improve the criminal justice system's response to violence against women, and enhance the services to female victims of violent crime in Ohio. While some projects receive both VAWA and Justice Assistance Grant, or JAG/Byrne funds, the money is distributed to most effectively meet a variety of needs within those agencies.

Residential Substance Abuse Treatment for State Prisoners (RSAT)

The RSAT program funds residential substance abuse programming at both the state and local levels. The RSAT program has more restrictive guidelines (separation from general population, length of time in treatment), so Byrne funds are used for promising projects that do not fit the RSAT guidelines.

JAG/Law Enforcement

Proposed to streamline justice funding and grant administration, the JAG program allows states, tribes, and local governments to support a broad range of activities to prevent and control crime based on their own local needs and conditions. JAG blends the previous Byrne Formula and Local Law Enforcement Block Grant programs to provide agencies with the flexibility to prioritize and place justice funds where they are needed most.

Family Violence Prevention and Services (FVPS)

The purpose of the FVPS program is to prevent incidents of family violence and to provide immediate shelter and related assistance for victims of family violence and their dependents. Funding for this program went to applicants who provided or helped provide temporary refuge and shelter to victims of family violence and their dependents in an effort to prevent future violence. Much like the situation with the VAWA program, some projects receive both FVPS and JAG/Byrne funds. The two grant programs are coordinated so they most effectively meet a variety of needs within those agencies.

SECTION II: EVALUATION PLAN AND ACTIVITIES

II. A. RATIONALE FOR EVALUATION PLAN

The National Institute of Justice (NIJ) guidelines document, titled “Evaluating Drug Control and System Improvement Projects,” provides the conceptual framework for organizing the evaluation of all OCJS-administered grant programs. The NIJ document distinguishes three types of evaluation: implementation, results, and outcomes/impact. The OCJS Evaluation Plan complies with this three-part distinction in the following ways:

1. **Implementation** – OCJS staff assess how well each project is organized and carried out through project monitoring. Staff from the Grants Planning and Evaluation (GP&E) Section conduct the monitoring. Annual phone interviews are conducted with all projects and on-site monitoring of 10 percent of all projects from each fiscal year of funding. The exception to this protocol is research projects. OCJS researchers conduct the monitoring of every research project.
2. **Results** – Monitoring is supplemented by information collected through the OCJS semi-annual performance reports. Results-level data are collected through these reports. These forms encompass questions identified by the State Reporting and Evaluation Program as well as questions of interest to policymakers in Ohio. GP&E staff periodically update the performance reports to better meet the information needs of BJA, OCJS, and the subgrantees. Performance reports are required for all funded projects.
3. **Outcomes** – Each grant calendar year, OCJS funds outcome evaluations of selected programs. Selection of programs for outcome evaluations is based on their strategic interest to the state and their implications for justice in Ohio. Outcome evaluations are conducted one of three ways: by OCJS researchers, by academic institutions, or through collaborative agreements between OCJS and academic institutions or other state agencies. Independent evaluators are used for outcome evaluation for two primary reasons: (a) technical expertise in evaluation methodologies, and (b) their independence lends credibility to their findings.

OCJS integrates the three types of evaluation, with semi-annual performance reports providing the link between monitoring and outcome evaluations. Semi-annual reports and monitoring together form the basis for awarding funds to continuation programs. Outcome evaluations are used in developing the Ohio Byrne Strategy and in amending program areas during intervening years.

II. B. STAFFING AND FINANCIAL RESOURCES DEVOTED TO THE EVALUATION EFFORT

During CY 2005, the Ohio Byrne Grant Program funded nine independent research projects totaling \$796,465. The research projects included program evaluations of crime prevention, disaster/terrorism preparedness, alternatives to incarceration, substance abuse treatment, offender reentry programs, and drug courts. Another research project studied the utility of NIBRS data for program planning. The research projects are described as part of their respective program area performance summaries.

SECTION III:

SUMMARY OF PROGRAMS ACTIVE DURING CY 2005 AND FUNDED UNDER THE BYRNE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAM FROM FFY 2004

Program Area A: Law Enforcement Task Forces

III. A. 1. PROGRAM OVERVIEW

Program Area A is open only to law enforcement agencies and is meant to supplement, rather than replace, local enforcement activities. Task forces focus attention on the trafficking of illicit drugs, but also investigate firearms and stolen goods as well as gangs and other organized forms of criminal activity. During CY 2005, OCJS funded 23 task forces from FFY 2004 funds in the amount of \$3,657,905.

III. A. 2. GOALS, OBJECTIVES, AND ACTIVITIES

Program Area A Goals:

Reduce the impact of drug and firearm traffickers, pharmaceutical diversion, gangs, terrorism, and other organized criminal activity on the health and safety of Ohio citizens through multi-jurisdictional collaboration.

Program Area A Objectives:

- To identify, investigate, and arrest multi-jurisdictional mid- and upper-level drug traffickers and/or pharmaceutical diverters in Ohio.
- To identify, investigate, arrest, and prosecute offenders illegally diverting pharmaceutical drugs.

Program Area A Activities and Requirements:

All task forces supported through the Ohio program are required to have met the following specifications:

- All task forces must be multi-jurisdictional and may be multi-disciplinary.
- The task forces must include prosecutors from each county represented by a participating law enforcement agency.
- All task forces must include at least one state or federal law enforcement agency as a participating agency.
- Task forces must establish a collaboration board to develop policies; allocate financial, personnel, and programmatic resources; and approve investigatory and prosecutorial plans for the task force. The collaboration board must be composed of representatives of all participating agencies that are responsible for developing policies allocating resources, and approving investigatory and prosecutorial plans.
- Projects with a pharmaceutical diversion component must include the Ohio State Pharmacy Board in their collaboration memo.
- All task force commanders or a designee are required to attend OCJS-sponsored task force commander meetings.

The Drug Enforcement Administration, the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation are participating agencies in more than half of Ohio's task forces. Other federal agencies participating in at least one Ohio task force include U.S. Coast Guard, U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, Internal Revenue Service, U.S. Attorney, and U.S. Marshal.

III. A. 3. PROGRAM PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND EVALUATION METHODS

Program performance measures and evaluation methods focus on the number of investigations of drug traffickers, the number of people arrested and prosecuted for drug trafficking and the amount of illicit drugs, stolen goods and/or firearms confiscated.

III. A. 4. PROGRAM ACCOMPLISHMENTS AND EVALUATION RESULTS

Summary of CY 2005 Program Accomplishments

Ohio's law enforcement task forces accomplished CY 2005 goals, posting increases for virtually all performance measures. During the year, the task forces arrested 6,544 offenders, with 4,686 of these offenders being charged with felony offenses. Ohio's drug markets were impacted by the task forces seizing 231,735 grams of cocaine and 78,726 grams of crack, 173,389 pounds of processed marijuana and 12,176 marijuana plants. Ohio's task forces also hit criminal enterprise by seizing \$14,221,218 in criminal assets. In addition to the quantities of arrests, drugs, and assets, the task forces took many steps to improve Ohio's justice system. Most notably is the improved coordination attained through implementation of the Ohio Task Force Commanders Association's Task Force Information System (TFIS).

**Ohio Multi-Jurisdictional Law Enforcement Task Forces At-A-Glance
Calendar Year 2005, FFY 2004 Projects**

<i>Activity</i>	<i>CY 2005 Total</i>
New Cases Initiated	8,407
Arrests	6,544
Cocaine Seized	231,735 grams
Crack Seized	78,726 grams
Marijuana Seized	173,389 pounds
Marijuana Plants Seized	12,176 plants
Heroin Seized	4,251 grams
Methamphetamine Seized	7,522 grams
Criminal Assets Seized	\$14,221,218
Criminal Assets Forfeited	\$2,448,286

Overview of Project Performance

Ohio's law enforcement task forces are designed to identify, investigate and arrest mid-to upper-level drug traffickers and violent offenders. The goal is not to supplant, but to supplement regular law enforcement by addressing offenders operating in a multi-jurisdictional region. These offenders are often difficult, if not impossible, to identify by an agency working only within one jurisdiction.

In order to make arrests, Ohio's task forces must first identify and investigate offenders operating across jurisdictional boundaries. During 2005, the task forces reported 8,407 new cases initiated, an average of 323 per task force per year. Fifteen percent of the new drug cases involved pharmaceuticals (1,260) and 85 percent were non-pharmaceutical drug cases (7,147). Additionally, the task forces assisted in 1,019 non-drug investigations. Altogether, Ohio's task forces were involved in 9,426 cases during CY 2005, an average of 363 per task force.

New Task Force Cases CY 2005, FFY 2004 Projects

<i>Type of Case</i>	<i>Number</i>
Number of new pharmaceutical cases initiated	1,260
Number of new non-pharmaceutical drug cases initiated	7,147
Number of non-drug investigations assisted	1,019

The investigations resulted in a reported 6,544 arrests during CY 2005. This is an average of 252 arrests per task force per year. Seventy-nine percent of the arrests were for non-pharmaceutical drugs. Pharmaceuticals accounted for eight percent and non-drug arrests were 13 percent of all arrests.

Task Force Arrests CY 2005, FFY 2004 Projects

<i>Type of Arrest</i>	<i>Number</i>
Number of pharmaceutical arrests	503
Number of non-pharmaceutical drug arrests	5,165
Number of non-drug arrests	876

Demographic data was available on 5,086 of the arrestees. As in the past, males were the vast majority (81 percent) of those arrested by Ohio's task forces. Only three percent of those arrested were juveniles. The majority of those arrested were Caucasians. Many of those arrested (42 percent) had a prior drug offense. About one in seven (14 percent) had a prior violent offense and one in ten (10 percent) had a prior property offense.

Demographics of Task Force Arrestees CY 2005, FFY 2004 Projects

<i>Demographic Category</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percent of all Arrestees</i>
Female	980	19%
Male	4106	81%
Juveniles	153	3%
African-American	2116	42%
Caucasian	2712	53%
Latino	222	4%
Other	36	1%
Prior Drug Offense	2,113	42%
Prior Property Offense	521	10%
Prior Violent Offense	727	14%

During the course of investigations, Ohio's drug task forces sometimes buy drugs as part of building the case. Drugs are also frequently seized when arrests are made. The table below

presents the amounts of non-pharmaceutical drugs removed from Ohio's streets through purchase and seizure by the task forces during CY 2005.

Type and Amount of Non-Pharmaceutical Drugs Removed CY 2005, FFY 2004 Projects

<i>Type of Non-Pharmaceutical Drug</i>	<i>Amount</i>
Cocaine	231,735 grams
Crack	78,726 grams
Ecstasy	37,706 dosage units
Heroin	4,251 grams
LSD	2,026 dosage units
Marijuana (processed)	173,389 pounds
Marijuana plants	12,176 plants
Methamphetamine	7,522 grams
Mushrooms	14,480 number
Other	12,310 grams

Ohio's task forces are actively involved in pharmaceutical diversion. During CY 2005, Hydrocodone (Vicodin/Loritab) and Oxycodone (Percocet/OxyContin) comprised the bulk of the pharmaceutical drugs involving the task forces.

Type and Amount of Pharmaceutical Drugs CY 2005, FFY 2004 Projects

<i>Type of Drug</i>	<i>Units Seized</i>	<i>Units Diverted</i>
Acetaminophen with Codeine (Tylenol with Codeine)	27	88
Alprazolam (Xanax)	243	2,309
Amphetamine mixture (Adderall)	393	60
Carisoprodol (Soma)	357	867
Diazepam (Valium)	1,831	4,412
Fentanyl (Duragesic Patches/Actiq/Liquid)	170	235
Hydrocodone (Vicodin/Loritab)	24,223	58,372
Hydromorphone (Dilaudid)	4	295
Lorazepam (Ativan)	2,018	2,090
Meperidine (Demerol)	2,022	2,290
Methadone (Liquid/Wafers/Pills)	1,029	7,667
Methylphenidate (Ritalin)	28	135
Morphine (MS Contin/Kadian)	394	5,607
Oxycodone (Percocet/OxyContin)	10,236	40,295
Pentazocine (Talwin)	4,869	0
Phentemine (Adipex/Fastin/Ionamin)	5,505	6,452
Propoxyphene (Darvocet)	1,050	3,945
Tramadol (Ultram)	331	10,373

Enforcement by Ohio's task forces resulted in 4,686 persons charged with felony offenses. The largest group of offenders was involved in Level 5 felonies. However, 516 offenders were charged with Level 1 felonies.

Task Force Arrestees Charged With Felony Offenses CY 2005, FFY 2004 Projects

<i>Felony Level</i>	<i>Number of Offenders</i>	<i>Percent of Offenders Charged with Felonies</i>
Felony 1	516	11%
Felony 2	424	9%
Felony 3	814	17%
Felony 4	1080	23%
Felony 5	1852	40%

Assets gained through criminal activity can be seized by Ohio's task forces. Seized criminal assets may then be forfeited to the task forces. Criminal asset seizure and forfeiture can cause significant damage to criminal enterprises. During CY 2005, Ohio's task forces reported seizing criminal assets estimated at \$14, 221, 218 and received \$2,448,286 in forfeitures.

Criminal Asset Seizures and Forfeitures CY 2005, FFY 2004 Projects

<i>Criminal Assets</i>	<i>Amount</i>
Criminal Assets Seized, estimated value	\$14,221,218
Criminal Assets Forfeited, actual value	\$2,448,286

Nearly half of the estimated value of seizures (49 percent) was currency. However, more than a million dollars in estimated value was seized for each real property, motor vehicles, and financial instruments (stocks, bonds, etc.)

Average Criminal Asset Seizures by Type CY 2005, FFY 2004 Projects

<i>Type of Seizure</i>	<i>Estimated Amount</i>	<i>Percent of Seizures</i>
Currency	\$6,905,036	49%
Financial Instruments	\$1,288,667	9%
Motor Vehicles	\$1,579,552	11%
Real Property	\$4,242,790	30%
Other	\$205,173	1%

Currency was by far the largest category for criminal assets actually forfeited to the task forces. The only other types of forfeitures accounting for more than \$100,000 were motor vehicles and real property.

Average Criminal Asset Forfeitures by Type CY 2005, FFY 2004 Projects

<i>Type of Forfeiture</i>	<i>Amount</i>	<i>Percent of Forfeitures</i>
Currency	\$2,106,955	86%
Financial Instruments	\$0	0%
Motor Vehicles	\$172,519	7%
Real Property	\$160,466	7%
Other	\$8,346	< 1%

Program Area B: Crime Prevention and Community Policing

III. B. 1. PROGRAM OVERVIEW

Program Area B is open to all eligible units of local government. Applicants are encouraged to develop crime prevention projects aimed at stopping criminal victimization before it happens. Such activities can be directed toward potential victims, potential offenders, or areas that give rise to crime. The Ohio Office of Criminal Justice Services funded 51 Community Crime Prevention/COP projects from FFY 2004 funds in the amount of \$2,847,212.

III. B. 2. GOALS, OBJECTIVES, AND ACTIVITIES

Program Area B Goals:

To prevent and reduce crime and the fear it brings to communities through collaborative crime prevention in order to maintain order, solve problems and improve the quality of life for Ohio citizens.

Program Area B Objectives:

- To prevent and reduce the fear of crime through a collaborative crime prevention project that promotes partnership among law enforcement, community groups and individuals.
- To promote police-citizen cooperation to address the problems of crime and social disorder, while improving the quality of life in the community.

Program Area B Activities and Requirements:

- The project may have collaboration boards, consisting of organizations actively participating with the project.
- Gang prevention projects must include law enforcement representation in the collaboration.
- Community oriented policing applicants must describe a plan of action for the implementation of community policing within all levels of the law enforcement agency. The plan must reflect the participation and cooperation of law enforcement, community members and public and private agencies.

III. B. 3. PROGRAM PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND EVALUATION METHODS

The number of increased community members with crime prevention knowledge is a program performance measure.

Conducting a community survey measuring fear of crime and knowledge of crime prevention techniques before and after collaboration with law enforcement is an evaluation method.

III. B. 4. PROGRAM ACCOMPLISHMENTS AND EVALUATION RESULTS

Summary of CY 2005 Program Accomplishments

During 2005, the Ohio Crime Prevention/COP program accomplished its objectives of increased inter-agency collaboration and citizen-police cooperation by providing services for more than 13,000 people, including more than 2,600 youth. These services were provided by a variety of agencies throughout Ohio, including 16 projects implemented by law enforcement agencies; 26 by non-law enforcement local service providers; six by courts, prosecution, or probation; six by statewide associations; two by local schools; two by colleges; three by faith-based agencies; four by state agencies; and five by other types of agencies. Funding for two of the 70 projects was used to conduct research, including a law enforcement training needs assessment and a community crime prevention research extension office.

**Ohio Community Crime Prevention/COP At-a-Glance
Calendar Year 2005, FFY 2004 Projects**

<i>Persons Directly Served</i>	<i>Total</i>
Number of persons directly served	13,284
Number of youth	2,607
Number of law enforcement and other criminal justice	834
Number of other local service providers	812
Number of parents and other care providers	739
Number of mentally ill	634
General public	7,379
Other	279

Overview of Project Performance

Forty percent of the projects were located in the metropolitan areas of Cleveland, Columbus and Cincinnati, and 44 percent were located in other metropolitan areas (Dayton and Akron) or in rural counties. Sixteen percent of projects had statewide influence.

Most of the Ohio crime prevention projects provide more than one program. Statewide in 2005, there were more than 280 direct service crime prevention programs funded through Byrne, an average of 4.1 per project. Forty-four percent of these programs served youth and their caregivers in some capacity.

Because youth programs comprised such a large percentage of all crime prevention programs, a discussion of juvenile crime prevention programs is provided, followed by a discussion of prevention programs not specific to juveniles. Finally, a brief description of two crime prevention research projects is given.

Crime Prevention Programs: Juvenile Programs

Programs serving juveniles were grouped into five categories based on their primary identified focus: substance abuse prevention, youth violence prevention, general crime prevention, school-related programs, and youth enrichment programs. In all, 115 programs fell into these categories.

Youth Oriented Crime Prevention Programs Calendar Year 2005, FFY 2004 Projects

<i>Type of Program</i>	<i>Number of Programs</i>	<i>Percent of all Programs</i>
Substance abuse prevention	24	20.8%
Youth violence prevention	11	9.6%
General crime prevention	31	27.0%
School-related programs	14	12.2%
Youth enrichment programs	14	12.2%
Other	21	18.3%

The following bullets highlight the types of programs funded within the categories.

- Substance abuse prevention programs offered programming on drug abuse, alcohol awareness, and illegal tobacco use by minors.
- Youth violence prevention programs included conflict resolution instruction, violence prevention education, bullying awareness, and domestic violence awareness.
- School-related crime prevention programs included at-risk youth tutoring initiatives, truancy reduction measures, and school resource officer funding. Additionally, school emergency management planning and the development of a school resource officer “toolkit” were funded.
 - School-related crime programs reported that 446 youth received direct services
- Youth enrichment programming included workforce development courses, employment services training, and life skill development.
- The “Other” category provided many diverse initiatives for at-risk youth, including delinquency recidivism prevention and HIV/AIDS education. Additionally, several athletic programs, such as camping and boxing, provided youth with alternatives to illegal behavior.

Spotlight on...

Cincinnati Campaign for a Safe Community

The Cincinnati Campaign for a Safe Community combines juvenile referral, parenting education, community service and counseling, and direct intervention in an effort to reduce and prevent crime, improve community/police relations, and generally improve the overall quality of life for the citizens of Cincinnati. The program concentrates efforts on youth residing in areas plagued with disproportionately high crime rates.

The project partners Lighthouse Youth Services and the Cincinnati Police Department to provide services to neighborhoods determined to be most at risk for gang and juvenile delinquency. By partnering with the communities, using problem oriented policing to implement effective solution, breaking the cycle of family violence, and by reducing youth crime and victimization, this program has reduced community/police tension, allowing for early intervention for at-risk youth in order to effect behavioral change.

In 2005, the program:

- Provided 1,125 police/case manager visits.
- Provided case management services to 130 families.
- Initiated 230 family counseling sessions.
- Provided 166 individual counseling sessions for at risk youth.

Crime Prevention Programs: Non-Juvenile Programs

Crime prevention programs not specific to juveniles tended to fall into three categories: 1) crime prevention and reduction through increased law enforcement efforts; 2) crime prevention and reduction through community awareness and participation; 3) crime prevention and reduction through training. In all, 171 programs fell into these categories. The following bullets highlight specific efforts.

Crime Prevention Programs Calendar Year 2005, FFY 2004 Projects

<i>Type of Program</i>	<i>Number of Programs</i>	<i>Percent of all Programs</i>
Crime prevention/reduction through increased law enforcement efforts	130	76.0%
Crime prevention/reduction through community awareness and participation	8	4.7%
Crime prevention/reduction through training	26	15.2%
Other	7	4.1%

- Four projects focused on the mentally ill in the criminal justice system, including three programs geared toward specialized training for law enforcement, and the fourth program geared toward building community collaborations between the criminal justice system and the mental health system to address the issue of reentry.
- Three projects focused on providing terrorism awareness and prevention training for law enforcement and other first responders.
- Five projects targeted specific crimes, including stalking, financial crimes, fraud, identity theft, and child support non-payment.
- Numerous community policing programs were created or continued that allowed for increased general or targeted enforcement capabilities. Some examples include the creation of bike patrols and individual officers or teams of officers to proactively work with residents and businesses in the community, and the training of officers and civilians in community policing tactics.
- Funded citizen-police initiatives allowed for the creation of 16 block watch programs.
- Unique collaborations were formed, including a county criminal justice council created to implement a long-term strategic plan and to create a grants management system to better evaluate criminal justice projects, and a joint probationer-police officer team to identify active probationers who face noncompliance issues or who need assistance with compliance and support issues.

Training was a component of more than one-third of all funded projects, including one research program designed specifically to assess the training needs for law enforcement. At least 26 unique training opportunities were offered, and most of these were offered numerous times. The following table identifies the types of sessions proposed and persons trained.

**Crime Prevention Training Programs
Calendar Year 2005, FFY 2004 Projects**

<i>Persons Trained</i>	<i>Number of Trainings</i>	<i>Percent of all Trainings</i>	<i>Number of People Trained</i>	<i>Percent of all People Trained</i>
Law enforcement	80	44.7%	662	41.8%
Other criminal justice agencies	6	3.4%	92	5.8%
Other service agencies	87	48.6%	812	51.3%
General public	6	3.4%	17	1.1%

CRIME OPPORTUNITY PREVENTION SERVICES

University of Cincinnati

Ohio government agencies, communities, and businesses have no systematic way of drawing upon the latest criminological research and practice to address their local crime and other related crime problems. Through the use of Byrne funding, the Criminal Justice Research Center at the University of Cincinnati developed the Ohio Service for Crime Opportunity Reduction (OSCOR) to assist law enforcement and other community groups in moving scientifically grounded crime and disorder analysis and problem-solving techniques into neighborhoods, schools, and businesses. OSCOR engages in three types of activities:

- Crime and disorder problem-solving assistance to local public and private decision makers to develop, implement, and evaluate innovative strategies to crime opportunity prevention.
- Applied research to improve understanding of when, where, and how crime patterns develop, and how public and private organizations can prevent crime patterns.
- Dissemination of crime opportunity prevention knowledge through web-based materials, conferences, and distance learning.

During 2005, OSCOR was involved in numerous crime-related problem-solving projects. One project involved the development and distribution of neighborhood crime reduction reports containing descriptions of crime opportunity blocking interventions to be used to target specific neighborhood crime and disorder problems. Other projects included an examination of open-air drug markets and recommendations to deter such activities; an evaluation of a university crime prevention program; an evaluation of a traffic barricade used to reduced drug dealing; and participation in an ongoing effort to establish a college campus consortium to collect data, disseminate information, and develop strategies to address interpersonal violence on campuses.

CRIME IN OHIO: ANALYSES OF OIBRS DATA

Ohio State University

The Ohio Incident-Based Reporting System is a recent innovation in crime reporting designed to facilitate law enforcement management and policing strategies, as well as to provide a foundation of knowledge suitable to address the information needs of law enforcement, the community, the media, and researchers. As the repository for OIBRS, the Ohio Office of Criminal Justice Services seeks to provide useful and user-friendly information to agencies involved in OIBRS reporting as one way of demonstrating payoffs for investing in the system. Ohio State University researchers received Byrne funding to examine the growing amount of OIBRS data to provide additional useful and user-friendly information to reporting law enforcement agencies.

The OSU-OIBRS project involved developing reports that examined refined categories of crime for specific Ohio jurisdictions. In particular, they examined the personal crimes of

homicide, assault, and domestic violence, as well as the property crime of larceny, for three different-sized jurisdictions in Ohio. In addition to reporting on the findings, the researchers also developed and distributed Access queries to allow others to extract useful information from the OIBRS database.

**CITIZEN ATTITUDES TOWARD HOMELAND SECURITY:
RESULTS OF A STATEWIDE SURVEY IN OHIO**

Ohio State University

This study surveyed citizen attitudes in Ohio in two areas: (1) citizens' concerns related to homeland security; and (2) how people have prepared for terrorism or natural disasters. OCJS funded this study to be used by Ohio Homeland Security and other agencies working for a more secure Ohio.

The interviews were conducted in June and July, 2005. Overall, 577 interviews were completed. Those completing the interviews matched Ohio census data on adult population age, median household income, and average persons per household. However, some groups were over-represented, including: females (60 percent vs. 51 percent of the state), Caucasians (90 percent vs. 85 percent of the state), and educational level attained (90 percent graduated from high school vs. 85 percent of the state; 28 percent with four-year college degree or higher vs. 21 percent of the state).

Ohio citizens reported that concern over terrorist attacks in their own neighborhood is low, with 10 percent indicating they worry "very often" or "often" about a terrorist attack. This level of concern is similar to the level of concern of violent crime or gangs in their neighborhood, and only slightly higher than concern over property crime. When asked what they worry about most in their neighborhood, more than 50 percent indicated drivers under the influence of alcohol or drugs. More than 40 percent of respondents said a terrorist attack in Ohio was "very likely" or "somewhat likely," and 80 percent thought a terrorist attack on the U.S. was likely. Citizens are more concerned drivers under the influence than they are about terrorist attacks. The results also showed the majority are not taking actions in preparation for a terrorist attack.

PROJECT GRAD

Ohio State University

To better assist juvenile justice professionals in making recommendations and referrals regarding court-involved youth based on reliable and valid information, researchers at Ohio State University's Center for Family Research developed the Global Risk Assessment Device (GRAD). The database that has resulted from information compiled by the GRAD has been used to examine various juvenile justice issues. OCJS provided funding to the center to support part-time student research associates to investigate issues related to mental health and substance abuse in at-risk adolescent populations. Research associates were funded for time periods corresponding to the academic calendar year. Two sets of two students each were funded: a graduate student and an honors undergraduate student were funded from September 2004 to June 2005, and two graduate students were funded from September 2005 to June 2006. As research associates, they

were required to work 20 hours per week, to regularly submit progress reports, to develop a final project report, and to present their findings to OCJS staff.

The topics that were investigated for Project GRAD from September 2004 through June 2005 were the following:

- An examination of the impact of gender and family characteristics on adolescent internalizing and externalizing behavior problems in a sample of court-involved youth and their families.
- A study on the impact of family and gender on adolescent substance abuse and subsequent relationship disruptions in a sample of court-involved youth.

Program Area C: Corrections, Alternatives, and Treatment

III. C. 1. PROGRAM OVERVIEW

Program Area C is open to all eligible units of local government. Applicants are to develop projects aimed at increasing community-based alternatives to incarceration and detention for non-violent offenders in Ohio. During CY 2005, the Ohio Office of Criminal Justice Services used FFY 2004 funds to support 26 corrections, alternatives, and treatment projects, including one program evaluation project and one research project, in the amount of \$1,363,132.

III. C. 2. GOALS, OBJECTIVES, AND ACTIVITIES

Program Area C Goals:

To increase community-based alternatives to incarceration and detention for non-violent offenders in Ohio, including residential and non-residential substance abuse programs, drug and mental health courts.

Program Area C Objectives:

- Increase community-based alternatives to incarceration and detention for non-violent offenders in Ohio, including residential and non-residential substance abuse programs, drug and mental health courts.

Program Area C Activities and Requirements:

- The collaboration must include a local Community Corrections Act Board if available, or a collaboration board representing law enforcement, common pleas judges, probation, community, public and private agencies.
- In absence of the proposed project, the offenders would be confined.
- Offenders receiving the proposed services are non-violent.
- Applicants for substance abuse projects must include either certification from the Ohio Department of Alcohol and Drug Addiction Services, or a statement of review from the local alcohol and drug addiction services board.
- Applicants must provide the admission requirements for the proposed program.
- Applicants must summarize the system used to assess offenders and refer them to appropriate services.
- Applicants must summarize the treatment program, including an example of a typical offender's day.

- Applicants must describe how offenders' progress in the project will be monitored and the sanction system that will be used for compliance/non-compliance.
- Applicants must provide criteria for successful/unsuccessful program completion.

III. C. 3. PROGRAM PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND EVALUATION METHODS

Program performance measures and evaluation methods focus on the following:

- The number of offenders diverted from incarceration and number of incarceration bed days saved.
- The number of offenders in treatment and other service programs and successful/unsuccessful completion of programs.
- The types of services/treatment offered to offenders and number of hours of service provided.

III. C. 4. PROGRAM ACCOMPLISHMENTS AND EVALUATION RESULTS

Summary of CY 2005 Program Accomplishments

During CY 2005, the Corrections, Alternatives, and Treatment programs accomplished the goal of providing community correction alternatives that serve the offenders' treatment needs. The projects reported serving 3,070 offenders. Some projects focused specifically on providing an alternative to incarceration. These projects estimated an average of 38.5 incarceration bed days saved per offender. Other projects provided treatment to offenders. Such projects indicated providing an average of 36 hours a week of counseling, training, and education services to offenders. Of offenders terminated across all Corrections, Alternatives, and Treatment programs during 2005, 73 percent successfully completed their program.

**Ohio Corrections, Alternatives, and Treatment
At-A-Glance
Calendar Year 2005, FFY 2004 Projects**

<i>Activity</i>	<i>CY 2005 Total</i>
Total number of offenders served	3,070
Average number of bed days saved per offender	38.5 days*
Percent of offenders successfully completing program	73%
Percent of offenders not successfully completing program	27%

* Mean number saved when both the average number of bed days and the number of offenders were reported for projects in which diversion from incarceration was a primary objective.

Overview of Project Performance

Of the direct service projects, 31 percent of the projects served pre-adjudication offenders, 61 percent served post-adjudication offenders and 8 percent served prison re-entry offenders. The projects reported serving 3,070 offenders, an average of 52 per project per year. These projects reported a 73 percent successful completion rate.

Seventy-two percent of offenders served were male. Caucasians made up three-fourths of all offenders served.

**Offenders Served
CY 2005, FFY 2004 Projects**

<i>Race/Ethnicity</i>	<i>Percent Male</i>	<i>Percent Female</i>	<i>Total</i>
African-American	13%	4%	17%
Caucasian	53%	23%	76%
Latino	1%	<1%	1%
Other	1%	<1%	1%
Race/Ethnicity unknown	4%	1%	5%
Total	72%	28%	100%

Programs within Corrections, Alternatives, and Treatment fell into two broad categories: alternatives to incarceration and offender treatment. Programs that were specifically designed to divert offenders from jail or prison, such as specialized courts, indicated saving an average of 38.5 incarceration bed days per offender.

Offender treatment was provided by numerous Ohio programs. Mental health treatment and substance abuse treatment/education made up nearly two-thirds of all offender programs offered by projects. More than half of all projects offered job training and placement programs.

**Programs with Services Provided
CY 2005, FFY 2004 Projects**

<i>Service</i>	<i>Percent of Programs with Service*</i>
Mental health treatment/counseling	71%
Substance abuse treatment/education	68%
Job training/placement	49%
Family services	29%
Basic education/GED	22%
Assessment	17%
Problem solving skills development	14%
College-level education	8%
Housing placement	3%
Other	29%

*All of the projects provided more than one type of service.

Projects reported an average of 36 hours per week of treatment services provided to offenders. Approximately two-thirds of these hours fell in the areas of counseling, assessment, and substance abuse education.

**Average Number of Treatment Hours Provided to Offenders
CY 2005, FFY 2004 Projects**

<i>Type of Treatment</i>	<i>Average Number of Hours per Week when the Service is Provided</i>
Individual counseling	1.7 hours
Peer counseling	2.8 hours
Twelve step	3.4 hours
Assessment	2.2 hours
Cognitive behavioral	5.8 hours
Substance abuse education	6.2 hours
Therapeutic community	1.0 hours
Problem solving skills development	4.2 hours
Educational/vocational training	3.9 hours
Other	4.8 hours
Total	36.0 hours

Thirty-six percent of programs designed specifically for the treatment of drug and alcohol dependent offenders reported that crack/cocaine was the offender's primary drug of choice, followed by alcohol (29 percent) and marijuana (21 percent). Heroin and amphetamines (including methamphetamine) were each reported to be the primary drug of choice of offenders in seven percent of the programs.

Of the offenders terminated from the Ohio projects during CY 2005, the average number of days in the program prior to an unsuccessful termination was approximately three-fourths the length of those successfully completing the program.

**Successful Completion
CY 2005, FFY 2004 Projects**

<i>Types of Termination</i>	<i>Percent of All Offenders Terminated</i>	<i>Average Number of Days in the Program*</i>
Percent successfully completed	73%	170 days
Percent terminated from the program unsuccessfully	15%	130 days
Percent absconded from their program	2%	34 days
Percent reported as "Other"	10%	91 days

* The mean number saved when both the average number of bed days and the number of offenders was reported.

Lack of cooperation accounted for more than 60 percent of those unsuccessfully terminated from the programs. Thirteen percent were terminated for failed urinalysis or some other indication of drug use.

Reason for Unsuccessful Termination CY 2005, FFY 2004 Projects	
<i>Reason for Unsuccessful Termination</i>	<i>Percent of Offenders</i>
Lack of cooperation	60%
Unexcused absences	21%
Failed urinalysis	8%
Other indication of drug use	5%
Other	7%

Twenty projects reported on sanctions they use with offenders. Of these projects, the most commonly used sanction was community service. More than one-half used electronic monitoring.

**Sanctions Used
CY 2005, FFY 2004 Projects**

<i>Sanction</i>	<i>Percent of Programs with Sanction*</i>
Community service	80%
Electronic monitoring	55%
Fines	45%
Victim restitution	40%

*Many projects reported using more than one type of sanction.

Summary of Evaluations

Evaluation of Ohio’s Drug Courts: A Cost-Benefit Analysis

Judges in Ohio and elsewhere are increasingly turning to specialized dockets (“drug courts”) for treating drug involved offenders and ending the revolving door of drug involved offenders returning again and again to court. Ohio has now emerged as a national leader in drug courts and other types of specialized dockets. Some evaluations of drug courts, including the University of Cincinnati’s 2002 evaluation of Ohio drug courts, have found the courts to be effective in reducing recidivism rates for the offenders served.

However, even if drug courts are effective in reducing recidivism, are those reductions large enough to warrant the additional costs associated with drug courts? OCJS provided JAG funding to the University of Cincinnati (UC) to answer this question specifically for Ohio’s drug courts.

UC approached this study through two sets of measurements. The first set was the treatment effect of lower recidivism for drug court participants. The second set estimated the marginal cost associated with drug court operations. Data was collected from five felony-level drug courts. Costs estimates were generated for law enforcement, courts (including prosecution and public defenders), probation, and commitment to a half-way house, CBCF, or prison.

The study found overall that felony drug courts in Ohio are effective and cost less than alternative sentences. Every one dollar spent on drug courts yielded a net savings of \$4.73. However, the cost savings varied with the type of sanction. Greater cost savings were found when drug courts were compared to residential programs (CBCFs, half-way houses, and prison). Cost savings were not found when drug courts were compared to probationers that received community-based treatment. The study notes, however, that most comparisons of drug courts to probationers are less restrictive and also include probationers who do not receive community-based treatment.

Also see **PROJECT GRAD** in Area B, Crime Prevention and Community Policing.

Program Area D: Victim Services

III. D. 1. PROGRAM OVERVIEW

Program Area D is for programs that assist prosecutors, law enforcement officers, courts and community-based agencies in providing supportive services to victims of crime. The program area is designed to establish victim services programs in areas of Ohio with the greatest needs and fewest resources. Funds assisted communities in effectively filling gaps in existing services and encouraging programs that can be replicated in other areas of the state. Multi-county projects are encouraged in areas where single county efforts are not feasible.

Victim assistance programs that are eligible include, but are not limited to, prosecutor, court or police-based victim assistance programs, rape crisis centers, domestic violence programs and other independent victim assistance programs. During this reporting period, the Ohio Office of Criminal Justice Services funded 33 Victim Services projects from FFY 2004 funds in the amount of \$804,071.

III. D. 2. GOALS, OBJECTIVES AND ACTIVITIES

Program Area D Goals:

To provide crime victims with needed services so that they may overcome the trauma of victimization, participate at all critical states of the criminal justice process, and return to full, active lives.

Program Area D Objectives:

- To increase services for jurors and witnesses who have received threats related to a court appearance.
- Provide victims with needed services and information about the criminal justice system.

Program Area D Activities and Requirements:

The collaboration must include law enforcement, prosecution and victim service providers. If developing a visitation center, the court and children services must also be collaborating.

- Applicants must describe how the victim will be notified of his/her rights, the Ohio Victims of Crime Compensation Program (administered by the Ohio Attorney General's Office) and the Office of Victims Services (housed in the Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction).
- Applicants must describe the process the project will take to assure victim/juror/witness safety.
- Applicants must indicate that the services proposed in the application are not a duplication of existing services within the community. The applicant must identify the existing services being provided along with the funding source and clearly indicate what gap this project will fill.
- Applicants must indicate how the project will market their services to potential users.

- If the applicant applied for VOCA or VAWA funding, a copy of the application must be submitted along with the Byrne application.

III. D. 3. PROGRAM PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND EVALUATION METHODS

Program performance measures and evaluation methods focus on the number of victims receiving additional services, as well as the number of victims participating in a particular stage of the criminal justice process.

III. D. 4. PROGRAM ACCOMPLISHMENTS AND EVALUATION RESULTS

Summary of CY 2005 Program Accomplishments

During CY 2005, the Ohio Victim Services Program was particularly effective in achieving its objective of providing victims with needed services and information. The program served 14,343 victims of crime in Ohio. The increased number African-Americans in Ohio’s urban areas receiving services noted in 2004 did not continue in 2005. African-Americans decreased from 26 percent during CY 2004 to 20 percent in CY 2005. The decrease resulted from fewer African-American females receiving services. This reflects Ohio’s Victim Services Program’s continued emphasis on services to victims of domestic violence. These victims accounted for 56 percent of all clients served by the Ohio program during CY 2005.

**Ohio Victim Services At-A-Glance
Calendar Year 2005, FFY 2004 Projects**

<i>Activity</i>	<i>CY 2005 Total</i>
Victims Reported Served	14,343
Percent Female Victims	73%
Percent of Clients Who were Victims of Violent Crime	99%
Percent of Projects Directly Providing Education	71%
Percent of Projects Directly Providing Crisis Intervention	71%
Percent of Projects Directly Providing Court Advocacy	71%

Overview of Project Performance

During calendar year 2005, projects funded through Ohio’s Victim Services Program report serving 14,343 clients. The projects served an average of 260 clients during 2005. There continues to be a steady demand for Ohio’s Victim Services Program to provide services to victims of domestic violence. These victims accounted for 56 percent of all clients served by the Ohio program during CY 2005.

**Ohio Victim Services Clients by Race/Ethnicity
CY 2005, FFY 2004 Projects**

<i>Race/Ethnicity</i>	<i>Percent Male</i>	<i>Percent Female</i>	<i>Total</i>
African-American	4%*	16%	20%
Caucasian	20%	50%	70%
Latino	<1%	1%	1%
Other Race/Ethnicity	<1%	<1%	1%
Race/Ethnicity Unknown	2%	6%	8%
Total	27%	73%	100%

** The percent in each cell is the percent that race/ethnicity and gender comprise of all victims served. For example, African-American males were four percent of all victims served by the Ohio projects.*

Mentally challenged victims were the largest group of special needs populations. Juveniles were reported as the next largest group at 26 percent of special needs victims served by Ohio's program. All other groups comprised less than 10 percent of the special needs populations.

**Ohio Victim Services Special Needs Populations
CY 2005, FFY 2004 Projects**

<i>Special Needs Group</i>	<i>Percent</i>
Appalachians	9%
Mentally/Emotionally Challenged	46%
Juveniles	26%
Medically Challenged	6%
Older People	7%
Lesbian/Gay/Bi-sexual/Transgender	3%
English Second Language	2%
Migrant Farm Workers	< 1%

During CY 2005, victims of violent crimes accounted for 88 percent of all clients served by Ohio's program. Seven percent were victims of property offenses and five percent were victims of other offenses. As in the past, domestic violence was the single largest offense category, accounting for 58 percent of victims served by Ohio's Victim Services Program. Note, however, that the response category on the reporting form is "domestic violence," but it appears that some projects are reporting all types of family violence in this category. No other offense category accounts for more than 8 percent of the victims.

**Crimes Victimizing Clients Served by Ohio Victim Services
CY 2005**

<i>Offense</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percent</i>
Attempted Murder	599	4%
Rape	1072	8%
Other Sexual Assault	551	4%
Domestic Violence	8260	58%
Assault	821	6%
Other Violent Offenses	677	5%
Property Offenses	951	7%
Elder Abuse/Neglect	126	1%
Child Abuse/Neglect	472	3%
Other Offenses	695	5%

Services provided by Ohio's Victim Services projects can be grouped as services the projects provide directly to victims and services to which they refer victims. During CY 2005, the projects reported an average of 4.3 services provided directly. The projects reported an average of 5.3 services to which they referred victims. The percent of Ohio victim projects providing specific services directly or by referral is presented in the table below. Note that the rows can total more than 100 percent since a project may both *provide* and *make referrals* for a service.

**Ohio Victim Services Provided
CY 2005, FFY 2004 Projects**

<i>Type of Service</i>	<i>Percent of Projects Providing the Service Directly</i>	<i>Percent of Projects Providing Referrals for the Service</i>
Education	73%	43%
Court Advocacy	73%	65%
Crisis Intervention	73%	55%
Training for Courts	43%	31%
Transportation	39%	47%
Counseling	31%	84%
Life Skills	22%	45%
Shelter	20%	76%
Medical Services	12%	57%
Other	41%	26%

Roughly three quarters of Ohio's Victim Services projects provided education, court advocacy and crisis intervention during CY 2005, similar to CY 2004. While medical services are least likely to be provided directly, counseling is the service most likely to be referred. The Ohio projects are also more likely to refer out counseling services rather to provide counseling directly. In general, the Ohio Victim Services projects are inclined toward providing crisis intervention, education and court-related services. The projects are more likely to refer victims to other agencies for court advocacy, shelter and counseling services.

Program Area E: Criminal Justice Information Systems (CJIS)

III. E. 1. PROGRAM OVERVIEW

The lack of adequate and timely criminal justice information has a profound impact on the ability of Ohio's criminal justice system to respond to crime in the state. This is felt in two basic ways. One is the lack of complete and timely information regarding individuals arrested or convicted for criminal offenses. For example, incomplete conviction records have resulted in much more lenient sentences for specific individuals than would have occurred if the judge had a complete conviction history available. Secondly, the ability of the state and local government to allocate criminal justice resources is limited by insufficient information regarding persons involved in the criminal justice system.

During CY 2005, the Ohio Office of Criminal Justice Services funded 36 CJIS projects from FFY 2004 grants in the amount of \$684,158.

III. E. 2. GOALS, OBJECTIVES, AND ACTIVITIES

Program Area E Goal:

The purpose of this program area is to meet the criminal justice information needs of the state and local officials. Funding will support the development of statewide systems designed to generate information on criminal arrests, or sentences. Furthermore, funding will support efforts to coordinate the exchange of information among these criminal justice information systems. Prominent in the development of these statewide systems will be their responsiveness to the policies developed by the Ohio Criminal Justice Information Systems Policy Board.

Program Area E Objectives:

All projects funded through this program must be designed to achieve at least one of the following objectives:

- To improve the quantity and quality of crime and arrest information reported to the Ohio Incident-Based Reporting System.
- To increase the quantity and quality of dispositional information reported to the Ohio Computerized Criminal Histories program.
- To improve the exchange of information among the criminal justice information systems within the state.

Program Area E Activities and Requirements:

- Projects must show that they have achieved compliance with or are working to achieve compliance with federal standards and auditing procedures appropriate to that information system.
- Projects must show that they have achieved compliance with or are working to achieve compliance with standards and auditing procedures adopted by the Ohio Criminal Justice Information System Policy Board.

III. E. 3. PROGRAM PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND EVALUATION METHODS

The number of Ohio agencies participating in CJIS-related programs.

The number of times Ohio criminal justice agencies access data through CJIS-related programs.

III. E. 4. PROGRAM ACCOMPLISHMENTS AND EVALUATION RESULTS

The criminal justice system contains information about suspects, crimes, victims, property, cases, and offenders. There is a need to manage this mass of data. Many of the applications developed to manage this data have historically been implemented agency-by-agency and function-by-function. While agencies realized sound benefits from these applications, the individual applications did not totally meet their needs because of their inability to share data with one another. Realizing the need to share information, then Governor George Voinovich, along with then Attorney General Betty Montgomery and Chief Justice Thomas Moyer, convened the Criminal Justice Information System (CJIS) Policy Board in 1994. The board was tasked with: advising on the improvement of the quantity, timeliness, and completeness of criminal justice information data; reviewing and developing policies and procedures for the state's criminal justice information systems; monitoring the development of criminal justice information systems to ensure compatibility; and determining how to improve accessibility to criminal justice data.

The CJIS Policy Board continues to meet on a regular basis and includes representatives of key Ohio CJIS stakeholders. This group consists of state-level executives who manage criminal justice information systems, as well as representatives from state criminal justice associations and the state's regional reporting centers. The role of the CJIS Policy Board is to monitor progress of the tasks within the CJIS Improvement Plan and to provide management and technical expertise for the strategic initiatives within the CJIS Plan.

The CJIS Improvement Plan was completed in December 1996. The Plan consisted of 63 projects outlined by the CJIS Policy Board deemed necessary for improving the quality, completeness, and timeliness of Ohio's criminal justice information systems. The CJIS Plan was updated in 2002 and contains 68 projects in various stages of completion. OCJS has received federal grant funds for the CJIS initiative since 1994. These funds have come from the following sources: the Edward Byrne/JAG Memorial 10 percent set-aside program, the National Criminal History Improvement Program, the National Sex Offender Registry Program and the State Identification System Grant Program. Additionally, General Revenue funds were allocated to assist with court disposition interfaces and other CJIS initiatives beginning in 1997.

Some of the 68 tasks were subdivided to differentiate between multiple stages and functions within the same task. Seventy-nine tasks and subtasks resulted from the

separation. Of the 79 tasks and subtasks, 48 are complete, 10 are closed, seven are ongoing, five are active, and nine have not yet been initiated. The following section summarizes the progress of some of the most significant Ohio CJIS projects.

Implement NCIC 2000 Services (CJIS Tasks 13 and 14)

The Ohio Department of Public Safety (ODPS) is upgrading the current LEADS system to have its connected devices National Crime Information Center 2000 Services-compliant. ODPS completed the first phase to convert to DMPP2020 protocol. Some of the regional interface agencies are complete, the rest need to be done by the end of the year. The deadline for the entire state being NCIC 2000-compliant is December 3, 2006.

Multi-Agency Radio Communications Service (MARCS) (CJIS Task 15)

MARCS is a statewide voice and data communications system to serve public safety and emergency management agencies within the state. There are more than 15,000 voice radios in use covering the entire state and more than 1,500 vehicles using data. The Ohio Office of Information Technology administers the ongoing technical assistance and maintenance to capture mobile voice and data coverage in the state.

Ohio Law Enforcement Officers Toolkit software (OIBRS) (CJIS Task 36)

The Ohio Law Enforcement Toolkit (LEOT) is an OIBRS/NIBRS-compliant records management system developed by OCJS. By the end of 2005 there were 313 Ohio law enforcement agencies using the existing system. This software is used 24 hours a day by patrol officers throughout the state. OCJS is responsible for developing, maintaining, and marketing this product. It is anticipated that the LEOT will reach Ohio Local Law Enforcement Information Sharing Network (OLLEISN) Level II certification early in 2006.

Ohio Incident-Based Reporting System (OIBRS) Repository (CJIS Task 59)

OCJS currently administers the OIBRS Repository for Ohio crime data collection. More than 315 Ohio law enforcement agencies contributed data to the OIBRS Repository in 2005, which is then electronically forwarded to the FBI in the NIBRS format. OCJS received NIBRS certification from the FBI in 1999. OCJS continues to heavily promote the IBR reporting standard to automate crime reporting in Ohio. The OIBRS Portal was enhanced to enable agencies to view their IBR validation errors online before submitting their data to OCJS. An OIBRS Partners Portal was also unveiled enabling vendors to check their edits in their software applications online against the edits in the OIBRS Repository.

Juvenile Justice Information System (CJIS Tasks 9, 33 and 66)

When completing the original CJIS Plan, the Policy Board's focus was primarily on the adult system. Due to increasing demands for information regarding juvenile offenders, requirements for submission of juvenile fingerprints, and the need to track juveniles placed in detention centers, the Policy Board determined that a Juvenile Justice Information System needs assessment should be conducted. The recommendations from the needs assessment have led to the creation of the Juvenile Justice Information System (JJIS) Steering Committee. The goal is to electronically connect the 88 Ohio Juvenile Courts to share information and enable electronic report transmission to the Ohio Department of Youth Services. By the end of 2005 there were 16 counties with signed MOUs in place to enable their data to be searchable through JJIS and six counties were actually searchable through JJIS.